

is considered not specific if a reasonable person familiar with the discharge review process after a review of the materials considered cannot determine the relationship between the applicant's submission and the particular circumstances of the case. This response may be used only if the submission is expressed in such general terms that no other response is applicable. For example, if the NDRB disagrees with the applicant as to the relevance of matters set forth in the submission, the NDRB normally will set forth the nature of the disagreement with respect to decisional issues, or it will reject the applicant's position. If the applicant's submission is so general that none of those provisions is applicable, then the NDRB may state that it cannot respond because the item is not specific.

**§ 724.806 Decisional issues.**

(a) *General.* Under the guidance in this section, the decisional document shall discuss the issues that provide a basis for the decision whether there should be a change in the character of or reason for discharge. In order to enhance clarity, the NDRB should not address matters other than issues relied upon in the decision or raised by the applicant.

(1) *Partial change.* When the decision changes a discharge, but does not provide the applicant with the full change in discharge requested, the decisional document shall address both the issues upon which change is granted and the issues upon which the NDRB denies the full change requested.

(2) *Relationship of issue of character of or reason for discharge.* Generally, the decisional document should specify whether a decisional issue applies to the character of or reason for discharge (or both), but it is not required to do so.

(3) *Relationship of an issue to propriety or equity.* (i) If an applicant identifies an issue as pertaining to both propriety and equity, the NDRB will consider it under both standards.

(ii) If an applicant identifies an issue as pertaining to the propriety of the discharge (for example, by citing a propriety standard or otherwise claiming that a change in discharge is required

as a matter of law), the NDRB shall consider the issue solely as a matter of propriety. Except as provided in § 724.806(a)(3)(d), the NDRB is not required to consider such an issue under the equity standards.

(iii) If the applicant's issue contends that the NDRB is required as a matter of law to follow a prior decision by setting forth an issue of propriety from the prior decision and describing its relationship to the applicant's case, the issue shall be considered under the propriety standards and addressed under § 724.806 (a) or (b).

(iv) If the applicant's issue sets forth principles of equity contained in a prior NDRB decision, describes the relationship to the applicant's case, and contends that the NDRB is required as a matter of law to follow the prior case, the decisional document shall note that the NDRB is not bound by its discretionary decisions in prior cases. However, the principles cited by the applicant, and the description of the relationship of the principles to the applicant's case, shall be considered and addressed under the equity standards.

(v) If the applicant's issue cannot be identified as a matter of propriety or equity, the NDRB shall address it as an issue of equity.

(b) *Change of discharge: issues of propriety.* If a change in the discharge is warranted under the propriety standards, the decisional document shall state that conclusion and list the errors of expressly retroactive changes in policy or violations of regulations that provide a basis for the conclusion. The decisional document shall cite the facts in the record that demonstrate the relevance of the error or change in policy to the applicant's case. If the change in discharge does not constitute the full change requested by the applicant, the reasons for not granting the full change shall be set forth.

(c) *Denial of the full change requested: issues of propriety.* (1) If the decision rejects the applicant's position on an issue of propriety, or if it is otherwise decided on the basis of an issue of propriety that the full change in discharge requested by the applicant is not warranted, the decisional document shall note that conclusion.

(2) The decisional document shall list reasons for its conclusion on each issue of propriety under the following guidance:

(i) If a reason is based in whole or in part upon a regulation, statute, constitutional provision, judicial determination, or other source of law, the NDRB shall cite the pertinent source of law and the facts in the record that demonstrate the relevance of the source of law to the particular circumstances in the case.

(ii) If a reason is based in whole or in part on a determination as to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an event or circumstances, including a factor required by applicable service regulations to be considered for determination of the character of and reason for the applicant's discharge, the NDRB shall make a finding of fact for each such event or circumstance.

(A) For each such finding, the decisional document shall list the specific source of the information relied upon. This may include the presumption of regularity in appropriate cases. If the information is listed in the service record section of the decisional document, a citation is not required.

(B) If a finding of fact is made after consideration of contradictory evidence in the record (including information cited by the applicant or otherwise identified by members of the NDRB), the decisional document shall set forth the conflicting evidence and explain why the information relied upon was more persuasive than the information that was rejected. If the presumption of regularity is cited as the basis for rejecting such information, the decisional document shall explain why the contradictory evidence was insufficient to overcome the presumption. In an appropriate case, the explanation as to why the contradictory evidence was insufficient to overcome the presumption of regularity may consist of a statement that the applicant failed to provide sufficient corroborating evidence, or that the NDRB did not find the applicant's testimony to be sufficiently credible to overcome the presumption.

(iii) If the NDRB disagrees with the position of the applicant on an issue of propriety, the following guidance ap-

plies in addition to the guidance in § 724.806(c)(2) (a) and (b):

(A) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position by explaining why it disagrees with the principles set forth in the applicant's issue (including principles derived from cases cited by the applicant in accordance with § 724.802(b)(4)).

(B) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position by explaining why the principles set forth in the applicant's issue (including principles derived from cases cited by the applicant in accordance with § 724.802(b)(4)) are not relevant to the applicant's case.

(C) The NDRB may reject an applicant's position by stating that the applicant's issue of propriety is not a matter upon which the NDRB grants a change in discharge, and by providing an explanation for this position. When the applicant indicates that the issue is to be considered in conjunction with one or more other specified issues, the explanation will address all such specified issues.

(D) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position on the grounds that other specified factors in the case preclude granting relief, regardless of whether the NDRB agreed with the applicant's position.

(E) If the applicant take the position that the discharge must be changed because of an alleged error in a record associated with the discharge, and the record has not been corrected by the organization with primary responsibility for corrective action, the NDRB may respond that it will presume the validity of the record in the absence of such corrective action. If the organization empowered to correct the record is within the Department of Defense, the NDRB should provide the applicant with a brief description of the procedures for requesting correction of the record. If the NDRB on its own motion cites this issue as a decisional issue on the basis of equity, it shall address the issue.

(F) When an applicant's issue contains a general allegation that a certain course of action violated his or her constitutional rights, the NDRB may respond in appropriate cases by noting that the action was consistent with statutory or regulatory authority, and

by citing the presumption of constitutionality that attaches to statutes and regulations. If, on the other hand, the applicant makes a specific challenge to the constitutionality of the action by challenging the application of a statute or regulation in a particular set of circumstances, it is not sufficient to respond solely by citing the presumption of constitutionality of the statute or regulation when the applicant is not challenging the constitutionality of the statute or regulation. Instead, the response must address the specific circumstances of the case.

(d) *Denial of the full change in discharge requested when propriety is not at issue.* If the applicant has not submitted an issue of propriety and the NDRB has not otherwise relied upon an issue of propriety to change the discharge, the decisional document shall contain a statement to that effect. The NDRB is not required to provide any further discussion as to the propriety of the discharge.

(e) *Change of discharge: issues of equity.* If the NDRB concludes that a change in the discharge is warranted under the equity standards, the decisional document shall list each issue of equity upon which this conclusion is based. The NDRB shall cite the facts in the record that demonstrate the relevance of the issue to the applicant's case. If the change in discharge does not constitute the full change requested by the applicant, the reasons for not giving the full change requested shall be discussed.

(f) *Denial of the full change in discharge requested: issues of equity.* (1) If the NDRB rejects the applicant's position on an issue of equity, or if the decision otherwise provides less than the full change in discharge requested by the applicant, the decisional document shall note that conclusion.

(2) The NDRB shall list reasons for its conclusion on each issue of equity under the following guidance:

(i) If a reason is based in whole or in part upon a regulation, statute, constitutional provision, judicial determination, or other source of law, the NDRB shall cite the pertinent source of law and the facts in the record that demonstrate the relevance of the source of law to the exercise of discre-

tion on the issue of equity in the applicant's case.

(ii) If a reason is based in whole or in part on a determination as to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an event or circumstance, including a factor required by applicable service regulations to be considered for determination of the character of and reason for the applicant's discharge, the NDRB shall make a finding of fact for each such event or circumstance.

(A) For each such finding, the decisional document shall list the specific source of the information relied upon. This may include the presumption of regularity in appropriate cases. If the information is listed in the service record section of the decisional document, a citation is not required.

(B) If a finding of fact is made after consideration of contradictory evidence in the record (including information cited by the applicant or otherwise identified by members of the NDRB), the decisional document shall set forth the conflicting evidence and explain why the information relied upon was more persuasive than the information that was rejected. If the presumption of regularity is cited as the basis for rejecting such information, the decisional document shall explain why the contradictory evidence was insufficient to overcome the presumption. In an appropriate case, the explanation as to why the contradictory evidence was insufficient to overcome the presumption of regularity may consist of a statement that the applicant failed to provide sufficient corroborating evidence, or that the NDRB did not find the applicant's testimony to be sufficiently credible to overcome the presumption.

(iii) If the NDRB disagrees with the position of the applicant on an issue of equity, the following guidance applies in addition to the guidance in paragraphs above:

(A) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position by explaining why it disagrees with the principles set forth in the applicant's issue (including principles derived from cases cited by the applicant).

(B) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position by explaining why the principles set forth in the applicant's

issue (including principles derived from cases cited by the applicant) are not relevant to the applicant's case.

(C) The NDRB may reject an applicant's position by explaining why the applicant's issue is not a matter upon which the NDRB grants a change in discharge as a matter of equity. When the applicant indicates that the issue is to be considered in conjunction with other specified issues, the explanation will address all such specified issues.

(D) The NDRB may reject the applicant's position on the grounds that other specified factors in the case preclude granting relief, regardless of whether the NDRB agrees with the applicant's position.

(E) If the applicant takes the position that the discharge should be changed as a matter of equity because of an alleged error in a record associated with the discharge, and the record has not been corrected by the organization with primary responsibility for corrective action, the NDRB may respond that it will presume the validity of the record in the absence of such corrective action. However, the NDRB will consider whether it should exercise its equitable powers to change the discharge on the basis of the alleged error. If it declines to do so, it shall explain why the applicant's position did not provide a sufficient basis for the change in the discharge requested by the applicant.

(iv) When NDRB concludes that aggravating factors outweigh mitigating factors, the NDRB must set forth reasons such as the seriousness of the offense, specific circumstances surrounding the offense, number of offenses, lack of mitigating circumstances, or similar factors. The NDRB is not required however, to explain why it relied on any such factors unless the applicability or weight of such a factor is expressly raised as an issue by the applicant.

(v) If the applicant has not submitted any issues and the NDRB has not otherwise relied upon an issue of equity for a change in discharge, the decisional document shall contain a statement to that effect, and shall note that the major factors upon which the discharge was based are set forth in the

service record portion of the decisional document.

#### **§ 724.807 Record of NDRB proceedings.**

(a) When the proceedings in any review have been concluded, a record thereof will be prepared. Records may include written records, electromagnetic records, audio and/or videotape recordings, or a combination.

(b) At a minimum, the record will include the following:

- (1) The application for review;
- (2) A record of the testimony in either verbatim, summarized, or recorded form at the option of the NDRB;
- (3) Documentary evidence or copies, other than the military service record considered by the NDRB;
- (4) Briefs and arguments submitted by or on behalf of the applicant;
- (5) Advisory opinions considered by the NDRB, if any;
- (6) The findings, conclusions, and reasons developed by the NDRB;
- (7) Notification of the NDRB's decision to the cognizant custodian of the applicant's records, or reference to the notification document;
- (8) A copy of the decisional document.

#### **§ 724.808 Issuance of decisions following discharge review.**

The applicant and counsel or representative, if any, shall be provided with a copy of the decisional document and of any further action in review. Final notification of decisions shall be issued to the applicant with a copy to the counsel or representative, if any, and to the service manager concerned.

(a) Notification to applicants, with copies to counsel or representatives, shall normally be made through the U.S. Postal Service. Such notification shall consist of a notification of decision, together with a copy of the decisional document.

(b) Notification to the service manager shall be for the purpose of appropriate action and inclusion of review matter in personnel records. Such notification shall bear appropriate certification of completeness and accuracy.

(c) Actions on review by superior authority, when occurring, shall be provided to the applicant and counsel or representative in the same manner as

to the notification of the review decision.

**§ 724.809 Final disposition of the record of proceedings.**

The original decisional document and all appendices thereto, shall in all cases be incorporated in the military service record of the applicant and the service record shall be returned to the custody of the appropriate record holding facility. If a portion of the original record of proceedings cannot be stored with the service record, the service record shall contain a notation as to the place where the record is stored. Other copies including any electromagnetic records, audio and/or videotape recordings or any combination thereof shall be filed in the NDRB case folder and disposed of in accordance with appropriate naval regulations.

**§ 724.810 Availability of Naval Discharge Review Board documents for public inspection and copying.**

(a) A copy of the decisional document prepared in accordance with subpart H of this enclosure shall be made available for public inspection and copying promptly after a notice of final decision is sent to the applicant.

(b) To prevent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, identifying details of the applicant and other persons will be deleted from documents made available for public inspection and copying.

(1) Names, addresses, social security numbers, and military service numbers must be deleted. Written justification shall be made for all other deletions and shall be available for public inspection.

(2) The NDRB shall ensure that there is a means for relating a decisional document number to the name of the applicant to permit retrieval of the applicant's records when required in processing a complaint.

(c) Any other privileged or classified material contained in or appended to any documents required by this Manual to be furnished the applicant and counsel or representative or made available for public inspection and copying may be deleted only if a written statement on the basis for the deletions is provided the applicant and

counsel or representative and made available for public inspection. It is not intended that the statement be so detailed as to reveal the nature of the withheld material.

(d) NDRB documents made available for public inspection and copying shall be located in the Armed Forces Discharge Review/Correction Board Reading Room. The documents shall be indexed in a usable and concise form so as to enable the public, and those who represent applicants before the NDRB, to isolate from all these decisions that are indexed, those cases that may be similar to an applicant's case and that indicate the circumstances under or reasons for (or both) which the NDRB or the Secretary concerned granted or denied relief.

(1) The reading file index shall include, in addition to any other item determined by the NDRB, the case number, the date, character of, reason and authority for the discharge. It shall also include the decisions of the NDRB and reviewing authority, if any, and the issues addressed in the statement of findings, conclusions, and reasons.

(2) The index shall be maintained at selected permanent locations throughout the United States. This ensures reasonable availability to applicants at least 30 days before a traveling panel review. A list of these locations shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER by the Department of the Army. The index shall also be made available at sites selected for traveling panels or hearing examinations for such periods as the NDRB is present and in operation. An applicant who has requested a traveling panel review shall be advised, in the notice of such review, of the permanent index locations.

(3) The Armed Forces Discharge Review/Corrections Board Reading Room shall publish indexes quarterly for all DRBs. The NDRB shall be responsible for timely submission to the Reading Room of individual case information required for update of the indexes. In addition, the NDRB shall be responsible for submission of new index categories based upon published changes in policy, procedures, or standards. These indexes shall be available for public inspection or purchase (or both) at the Reading Room. When the NDRB

has accepted an application, information concerning the availability of the index shall be provided in the NDRB's response to the application.

**§ 724.811 Privacy Act information.**

Information protected under the Privacy Act is involved in the discharge review functions. The provisions of SECNAVINST 5211.5C shall be observed throughout the processing of a request for review of discharge or dismissal.

**§ 724.812 Responsibilities of the Reading Room.**

(a) Copies of decisional documents will be provided to individuals or organizations outside the NCR in response to written requests for such documents. Although the Reading Room shall try to make timely responses to such requests, certain factors such as the length of a request, the volume of other pending requests, and the impact of other responsibilities of the staff assigned to such duties may cause some delays. A fee may be charged for such documents under appropriate DOD and Department of the Army directives and regulations. The manual that accompanies the index of decisions shall notify the public that if an applicant indicates that a review is scheduled for a specific date, an effort will be made to provide requested decisional documents before that date. The individual or organization will be advised if that cannot be accomplished.

(b) Correspondence relating to matters under the cognizance of the Reading Room (including requests for purchase of indexes) shall be addressed to:

DA Military Review Board Agency, Attention: SFBA (Reading Room), Room 1E520, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310.

**§ 724.813 The recommendation of the NDRB president.**

(a) *General.* The president of the NDRB may forward cases for consideration by the Secretarial Review Authority (SRA). There is no requirement that the president submit a recommendation when a case is forwarded to the SRA. If the president makes a recommendation with respect to the character of or reason for discharge, however, the recommendation shall be

prepared under the guidance in § 724.813b.

(b) *Format for recommendation.* If a recommendation is provided, it shall contain the president's view whether there should be a change in the character of or reason for discharge (or both). If the president recommends such a change, the particular change to be made shall be specified. The recommendation shall set forth the president's position on decisional issues and issues submitted by the applicant under the following guidance:

(1) *Adoption of the NDRB's decisional document.* The recommendation may state that the president has adopted the decisional document prepared by the majority. The president shall ensure that the decisional document meets the requirements of this enclosure.

(2) *Adoption of the specific statements from the majority.* If the President adopts the views of the majority only in part, the recommendation shall cite the specific matter adopted from the majority. If the president modifies a statement submitted by the majority, the recommendation shall set forth the modification.

(3) *Response to issues not included in matter adopted from the majority.* The recommendation shall set forth the following if not adopted in whole or in part from the majority:

(i) The issues on which the president's recommendation is based. Each such decisional issue shall be addressed by the president.

(ii) The president's response to items submitted as issues by the applicant.

(iii) Reasons for rejecting the conclusion of the majority with respect to the decisional document which, if resolved in the applicant's favor, would have resulted in greater relief for the applicant than that afforded by the president's recommendation. Such issues shall be addressed under the principles in § 724.806.

**§ 724.814 Secretarial Review Authority (SRA).**

(a) *Review by the SRA.* The Secretarial Review Authority (SRA) is the Secretary concerned or the official to whom Secretary's discharge review authority has been delegated.

(1) The SRA may review the following types of cases before issuance of the final notification of a decision:

(i) Any specific case in which the SRA has an interest.

(ii) Any specific case that the president of the NDRB believes is of significant interest to the SRA.

(2) Cases reviewed by the SRA shall be considered under the standards set forth in this part.

(b) *Processing the decisional document.*

(1) The decisional document shall be transmitted by the NDRB president under § 724.813.

(2) The following guidance applies to cases that have been forwarded to the SRA except for cases reviewed on the NDRB's own motion, without the participation of the applicant or the applicant's counsel:

(i) The applicant and counsel or representative, if any, shall be provided with a copy of the proposed decisional document, including the NDRB president's recommendation to the SRA, if any. Classified information shall be summarized.

(ii) The applicant shall be provided with a reasonable period of time, but not less than 25 days, to submit a rebuttal to the SRA. Any issue in rebuttal consists of a clear and specific statement by the applicant in support of or in opposition to the statements of the NDRB or NDRB president on decisional issues and other clear and specific issues that were submitted by the applicant. The rebuttal shall be based solely on matters in the record before the NDRB closed the case for deliberation or in the president's recommendation.

(c) *Review of the decisional document.* If corrections in the decisional document are required, the decisional document shall be returned to the NDRB for corrective action. The corrected decisional document shall be sent to the applicant (and counsel, if any), but a further opportunity for rebuttal is not required unless the correction produces a different result or includes a substantial change in the decision by the NDRB (or NDRB president) of the issues raised by the majority or the applicant.

(d) *The addendum of the SRA.* The decision of the SRA shall be in writing

and shall be appended as an addendum to the decisional document under the guidance in this subsection.

(1) *The SRA's decision.* The addendum shall set forth the SRA's decision whether there will be a change in the character of or reason for discharge (or both); if the SRA concludes that a change is warranted, the particular change to be made shall be specified. If the SRA adopts the decision recommended by the NDRB or the NDRB president, the decisional document shall contain a reference to the matter adopted.

(2) *Discussion of issues.* In support of the SRA's decision, the addendum shall set forth the SRA's position on decisional issues, items submitted as issues by an applicant and issues raised by the NDRB and the NDRB president in accordance with the following guidance:

(i) *Adoption of the NDRB president's recommendation.* The addendum may state that the SRA has adopted the NDRB president's recommendation.

(ii) *Adoption of the NDRB's proposed decisional document.* The addendum may state that the SRA has adopted the proposed decisional document prepared by the NDRB.

(iii) *Adoption of specific statements from the majority or the NDRB president.* If the SRA adopts the views of the NDRB or the NDRB president only in part, the addendum shall cite the specific statements adopted. If the SRA modifies a statement submitted by the NDRB or the NDRB president, the addendum shall set forth the modification.

(iv) *Response to issues not included in matter adopted from the NDRB or the NDRB president.* The addendum shall set forth the following if not adopted in whole or in part from the NDRB or the NDRB president:

(A) A list of the issues on which the SRA's decision is based. Each such decisional document issue shall be addressed by the SRA. This includes reasons for rejecting the conclusion of the NDRB or the NDRB president with respect to decisional issues which, if resolved in the applicant's favor, would have resulted in a change to the discharge more favorable to the applicant

than that afforded by the SRA's decision. Such issues shall be addressed under the principles in § 724.806(f).

(B) The SRA's response to items submitted as issues by the applicant.

(3) *Response to the rebuttal.* (i) If the SRA grants the full change in discharge requested by the applicant (or a more favorable change), that fact shall be noted, the decisional issues shall be addressed and no further response to the rebuttal is required.

(ii) If the SRA does not grant the full change in discharge requested by the applicant (or a more favorable change), the addendum shall list each issue in rebuttal submitted by an applicant in accordance with this section, and shall set forth the response of the SRA under the following guidance:

(A) If the SRA rejects an issue in rebuttal, the SRA may respond in accordance with the principals in § 724.806.

(B) If the matter adopted by the SRA provides a basis for the SRA's rejection of the rebuttal material, the SRA may note that fact and cite the specific matter adopted that responds to the issue in rebuttal.

(C) If the matter submitted by the applicant does not meet the requirements for rebuttal material, that fact shall be noted.

(4) *Index entries.* Appropriate index entries shall be prepared for the SRA's actions for matters that are not adopted from the NDRB's proposed decisional document.

#### **§ 724.815 Complaints.**

A complaint is any correspondence in which it is alleged that a decisional document issued by the NDRB or the SRA contains a specifically identified violation of 32 CFR part 70 or any references thereto. Complaints will be reviewed pursuant to 32 CFR part 70.

### **Subpart I—Standards for Discharge Review**

#### **§ 724.901 Objective of discharge review.**

The objective of a discharge review is to examine the propriety and equity of the applicant's discharge and to effect changes, if necessary. The standards of the review and the underlying factors

which aid in determining whether the standards are met shall be consistent with historical criteria for determining honorable service. No factors shall be established that require automatic change or denial of a change in a discharge. Neither the NDRB nor the Secretary of the Navy shall be bound by any methodology of weighting of the factors in reaching a determination. In each case, the NDRB shall give full, fair, and impartial consideration to all applicable factors before reaching a decision. An applicant may not receive a less favorable discharge than that issued at the time of separation. This does not preclude correction of clerical errors.

#### **§ 724.902 Propriety of the discharge.**

(a) A discharge shall be deemed to be proper unless, in the course of discharge review, it is determined that:

(1) There exists an error of fact, law, procedure, or discretion associated with the discharge at the time of issuance; and that the rights of the applicant were prejudiced thereby (such error shall constitute prejudicial error if there is substantial doubt that the discharge would have remained the same if the error had not been made); or

(2) A change in policy by the military service of which the applicant was a member, made expressly retroactive to the type of discharge under consideration, requires a change in the discharge.

(b) When a record associated with the discharge at the time of issuance involves a matter in which the primary responsibility for corrective action rests with another organization (for example, another Board, agency, or court) the NDRB will recognize an error only to the extent that the error has been corrected by the organization with primary responsibility for correcting the record.

(c) The primary function of the NDRB is to exercise its discretion on issues of equity by reviewing the individual merits of each application on a case-by-case basis. Prior decisions in which the NDRB exercised its discretion to change a discharge based on issues of equity (including the factors cited in such decisions or the weight



given to factors in such decisions) do not bind the NDRB in its review of subsequent cases because no two cases present the same issues of equity.

(d) The following applies to applicants who received less than fully honorable administrative discharges because of their civilian misconduct while in an inactive duty status in a reserve component and who were discharged or had their discharge reviewed on or after April 20, 1971: the NDRB shall either recharacterize the discharge to Honorable without any additional proceedings or additional proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the Court's Order of December 3, 1981, in *Wood v. Secretary of Defense* to determine whether proper grounds exist for the issuance of a less than honorable discharge, taking into account that:

(1) An other than honorable (formerly undesirable) discharge for an inactive duty reservist can only be based upon civilian misconduct found to have affected directly the performance of military duties;

(2) A general discharge for an inactive duty reservist can only be based upon civilian misconduct found to have had an adverse impact on the overall effectiveness of the military, including military morale and efficiency.

#### **§ 724.903 Equity of the discharge.**

A discharge shall be deemed to be equitable unless:

(a) In the course of a discharge review, it is determined that the policies and procedures under which the applicant was discharged differ in material respects from policies and procedures currently applicable on a service-wide basis to discharges of the type under consideration, provided that:

(1) Current policies or procedures represent a substantial enhancement of the rights afforded a respondent in such proceedings; and

(2) There is substantial doubt that the applicant would have received the same discharge, if relevant current policies and procedures had been available to the applicant at the time of the discharge proceedings under consideration.

(b) At the time of issuance, the discharge was inconsistent with standards

of discipline in the military service of which the applicant was a member.

(c) In the course of a discharge review, it is determined that relief is warranted based upon consideration of the applicant's service record and other evidence presented to the NDRB viewed in conjunction with the factors listed in this paragraph and the regulations under which the applicant was discharged, even though the discharge was determined to have been otherwise equitable and proper at the time of issuance. Areas of consideration include, but are not limited to:

(1) Quality of service, as evidenced by factors such as:

(i) Service history, including date of enlistment, period of enlistment, highest rank achieved, conduct and proficiency ratings (numerical and narrative);

(ii) Awards and decorations;

(iii) Letters of commendation or reprimand;

(iv) Combat service;

(v) Wounds received in action;

(vi) Records of promotions and demotions;

(vii) Level of responsibility at which the applicant served;

(viii) Other acts of merit that may not have resulted in formal recognition through an award or commendation;

(ix) Length of service during the service period which is the subject of the discharge review;

(x) Prior military service and type of discharge received or outstanding post service conduct to the extent that such matters provide a basis for a more thorough understanding of the performance of the applicant during the period of service which is the subject of the discharge review;

(xi) Convictions by court-martial;

(xii) Records of nonjudicial punishment;

(xiii) Convictions by civil authorities while a member of the service, reflected in the discharge proceedings or otherwise noted in the service records;

(xiv) Records of periods of unauthorized absence;

(xv) Records relating to a discharge in lieu of court-martial.

(2) Capability to serve, as evidenced by factors such as:

(i) *Total capabilities.* This includes an evaluation of matters such as age, educational level, and aptitude scores. Consideration may also be given as to whether the individual met normal military standards of acceptability for military service and similar indicators of an individual's ability to serve satisfactorily, as well as ability to adjust to military service.

(ii) *Family and personal problems.* This includes matters in extenuation or mitigation of the reason for discharge that may have affected the applicant's ability to serve satisfactorily.

(iii) *Arbitrary or capricious actions.* This includes actions by individuals in authority which constitute a clear abuse of such authority and that, although not amounting to prejudicial error, may have contributed to the decision to discharge the individual or unduly influence the characterization of service.

(iv) *Discrimination.* This includes unauthorized acts as documented by records or other evidence.

#### APPENDIX A TO PART 724—POLICY STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE—ADDRESSING CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF DISCHARGES

Secretary of Defense memorandum of August 13, 1971, to the Secretaries of the Military Departments, The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Subject: Review of Discharges Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Issued to Drug Users:

"Consistent with Department of Defense Directive 1300.11, October 23, 1970, and my memorandum of July 7, 1971, concerning rehabilitation and treatment of drug users, administrative discharges under other than honorable conditions issued solely on the basis of personal use of drugs or possession of drugs for the purpose of such use will be reviewed for recharacterization.

"Accordingly, each Secretary of a Military Department, acting through his Discharge Review Board, will consider applications for such review from former service members. Each Secretary is authorized to issue a discharge under honorable conditions upon establishment of facts consistent with this policy. Former service members will be notified of the results of the review. The Veterans' Administration will also be notified of the names of former service members whose discharges are recharacterized.

"The statute of limitations for review of discharges within the scope of this policy

will be in accordance with 10 United States Code 1553.

"This policy shall apply to those service members whose cases are finalized or in process on or before July 7, 1971".

Secretary of Defense memorandum of April 28, 1972, to Secretaries of the Military Departments, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Subject: Review of Punitive Discharges Issued to Drug Users:

"Reference is made to Secretary Packard's memorandum of July 7, 1971, concerning rehabilitation and treatment of drug users, and my memorandum of August 13, 1971, subject: 'Review of Discharges Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Issued to Drug Users.'

"My August 13, 1971 memorandum established the current Departmental policy that administrative discharges under other than honorable conditions issued solely on the basis of personal use of drugs or possession of drugs for the purpose of such use will be reviewed for recharacterization to under honorable conditions.

"It is my desire that this policy be expanded to include punitive discharges and dismissals resulting from approved sentences of courts-martial issued solely for conviction of personal use of drugs or possession of drugs for the purpose of such use.

"Review and recharacterization are to be effected, upon the application of former service members, utilizing the procedures and authority set forth in Title 10, United States Code, sections 874(b), 1552 and 1553.

"This policy is applicable only to discharges which have been executed on or before July 7, 1971, or issued as a result of a case in process on or before July 7, 1971.

"Former service members requesting a review will be notified of the results of the review. The Veterans' Administration will also be notified of the names of former service members whose discharges are recharacterized."

#### APPENDIX B TO PART 724—OATH OR AFFIRMATION TO BE ADMINISTERED TO DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Prior to undertaking duties as a Board member, each person assigned to such duties in the precept of the Board shall execute the following oath or affirmation which shall continue in effect throughout service with the Board.

##### *Oath/Affirmation*

I, ———, do swear or affirm that I will faithfully and impartially perform all the duties incumbent upon me as a member of the Naval Discharge Review Board; that I will fully and objectively inquire into and examine all cases coming before me; that I will, without regard to the status of the individual in any case, render my individual

## Department of the Navy, DoD

## Pt. 724, App. D

judgment according to the facts, my conscience and the law and regulations applicable to review of naval discharges, so help me God.

### APPENDIX C TO PART 724—SAMPLES OF FORMATS EMPLOYED BY THE NAVAL DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Attachment	Form	Title
1	Letter .....	En Block Notification of Decision to Commander, Naval Military Personnel Command (No Change).
2	.....do .....	En Block Notification of Decision to Commander, Naval Military Personnel Command (Change).
3	.....do .....	En Block Notification of Decision to Commandant, Marine Corps (No Change).
4	.....do .....	En Block Notification of Decision to Commandant, Marine Corps (Change).

NOTE: The Forms appearing in Appendix C are not carried in the Code of Federal Regulations.

### APPENDIX D TO PART 724—VETERANS' BENEFITS

91 Stat. 1106  
Pub. L. 95-126, Oct. 8, 1977  
95th Congress

#### *An Act*

To deny entitlement to veterans' benefits to certain persons who would otherwise become so entitled solely by virtue of the administrative upgrading under temporarily revised standards of other than honorable discharges from service during the Vietnam era; to require case-by-case review under uniform, historically consistent, generally applicable standards and procedures prior to the award of veterans' benefits to persons administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions from active military, naval, or air service; and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3103 of Title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) Inserting "or on the basis of an absence without authority from active duty for a continuous period of at least one hundred and eighty days if such person was discharged under conditions other than honorable unless such person demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Administrator that there are compelling circumstances to warrant such prolonged unauthorized absence." after "deserter," in subsection (a), and by inserting a comma and "notwithstanding any action subsequent to the date of such discharge by a board established pursuant to section 1553

of title 10" before the period at the end of such subsection; and

(2) Adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (A) no benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be provided, as a result of a change in or new issuance of a discharge under section 1553 of title 10, except upon a case-by-case review by the board of review concerned, subject to review by the Secretary concerned, under such section, of all the evidence and factors in each case under published uniform standard (which shall be historically consistent with criteria for determining honorable service and shall not include any criterion for automatically granting or denying such change or issuance) and procedures generally applicable to all persons administratively discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service under other than honorable conditions; and (B) any such person shall be afforded an opportunity to apply for such review under such section 1553 for a period of time terminating not less than one year after the date on which such uniform standards and procedures are promulgated and published.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(A) No person discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service under other than honorable conditions who has been awarded a general or honorable discharge under revised standards for the review of discharges, (i) as implemented by the President's directive of January 19, 1977, initiating further action with respect to the President's Proclamation 4313 of September 16, 1974, (ii) as implemented on or after April 5, 1977, under the Department of Defense's special discharge review program, or (iii) as implemented subsequent to April 5, 1977, and not made applicable to all persons administratively discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service under other than honorable conditions, shall be entitled to benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration except upon a determination, based on a case-by-case review, under standards (meeting the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection) applied by the board of review concerned under section 1553 of title 10, subject to review by the Secretary concerned, that such person would be awarded an upgraded discharged under such standards;

"(B) Such determination shall be made by such board, (i) on an expedited basis after notification by the Veterans' Administration to the Secretary concerned that such person has received, is in receipt of, or has applied for such benefits or after a written request is made by such person or such determination, (ii) on its own initiative within one year after the date of enactment of this paragraph

in any case where a general or honorable discharge has been awarded on or prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph under revised standards referred to in clause (A) (i), (ii), or (iii) of this paragraph, or (iii) on its own initiative at the time a general or honorable discharge is so awarded in any case where a general or honorable discharge is awarded after such enactment date.

"If such board makes a preliminary determination that such person would not have been awarded an upgraded discharge under standards meeting the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection, such person shall be entitled to an appearance before the board, as provided for in section 1553(c) of title 10, prior to a final determination on such question and shall be given written notice by the board of such preliminary determination and of his or her right to such appearance. The Administrator shall, as soon as administratively feasible, notify the appropriate board of review of the receipt of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or the application for such benefits, by any person awarded an upgraded discharge under revised standards referred to in clause (A) (i), (ii), or (iii) of this paragraph with respect to whom a favorable determination has not been made under this paragraph."

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall fully inform each person awarded a general or honorable discharge under revised standards for the review of discharges referred to in section 3103(e)(2)(A) (i), (ii), or (iii) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section of his or her right to obtain an expedited determination under section 3103(e)(2)(B)(i) of such title and of the implications of the provisions of this Act for each such person.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense shall inform each person who applies to a board of review under section 1553 of title 10, United States Code, and who appears to have been discharged under circumstances which might constitute a bar to benefits under section 3103(a), of title 38, United States Code, (A) that such person might possibly be administratively found to be entitled to benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration only through the action of a board for the correction of military records under section 1552 of such title 10 or the action of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under section 3103 of such title 38, and (B) of the procedures for making application to such section 1552 board for such purpose and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for such purpose (including the right to proceed concurrently under such sections 3103, 1552 and 1553).

Section 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall provide the type of health care

and related benefits authorized to be provided under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for any disability incurred or aggravated during active military, naval, or air service in line of duty by a person other than a person barred from receiving benefits by section 3103(a) of such title, but shall not provide such health care and related benefits pursuant to this section for any disability incurred or aggravated during a period of service from which such person was discharged by reason of a bad conduct discharge.

Section 3. Paragraph (18) of section 101 of Title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(18) The term 'discharge or release' includes, (A) retirement from the active military, naval, or air service, and (B) the satisfactory completion of the period of active military, naval, or air service for which a person was obligated at the time of entry into such service in the case of a person who, due to enlistment or reenlistment, was not awarded a discharge or release from such period of service at the time of such completion thereof and who, at such time, would otherwise have been eligible for the award of a discharge or release under conditions other than dishonorable."

Section 4. In promulgating, or making any revisions of or amendments to, regulations governing the standards and procedures by which the Veterans' Administration determines whether a person was discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service under conditions other than dishonorable, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, in keeping with the spirit and intent of this Act, not promulgate any such regulations or revise or amend any such regulations for the purpose of, or having the effect of, (1) providing any unique or special advantage to veterans awarded general or honorable discharges under revised standards for the review of discharges described in section 3103(e)(2)(A) (i), (ii), or (iii) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 1(a)(2) of this Act, or (2) otherwise making any special distinction between such veterans and other veterans.

Section 5. This Act shall become effective on the date of its enactment, except that—

(1) Section 2 shall become effective on October 1, 1977, or on such enactment date, whichever is later; and

(2) The amendments made by section 1(a) shall apply retroactively to deny benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(A) With respect to any person who, on such enactment date is receiving benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, (i) such benefits shall not be terminated under paragraph (2) of section 3103(e) of title 38, United States Code, as

added by section 1(a)(2) of this Act, until, (I) the day on which a final determination not favorable to the person concerned is made on an expedited basis under paragraph (2) of such section 3103(e), (II) the day following the expiration of ninety days after a preliminary determination not favorable to such person is made under such paragraph, or (III) the day following the expiration of one hundred and eighty days after such enactment date, whichever day is the earliest, and (ii) the United States shall not make any claim to recover the value of any benefits provided to such person prior to such earliest day;

(B) With respect to any person awarded a general or honorable discharge under revised standards for the review of discharges referred to in clause (A) (i), (ii), or (iii) of such paragraph who has been provided any such benefits prior to such enactment date, the United States shall not make any claim to recover the value of any benefits so provided; and

(C) The amendments made by clause (1) of section 1(a) shall apply, (i) retroactively only to persons awarded general or honorable discharges under such revised standards and to persons who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, had not attained general eligibility to such benefits by virtue of (I) a change in or new issuance of a discharge under section 1553 of title 10, United States Code, or (II) any other provision of law, and (ii) prospectively (on and after such enactment date) to all other persons.

## PART 725—RELEASE OF OFFICIAL INFORMATION FOR LITIGATION PURPOSES AND TESTIMONY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY PERSONNEL

Sec.

725.1 Purpose.

725.2 Policy.

725.3 Authority to act.

725.4 Definitions.

725.5 Applicability.

725.6 Authority to determine and respond.

725.7 Contents of a proper request or demand.

725.8 Considerations in determining to grant or deny a request.

725.9 Action to grant or deny a request.

725.10 Response to requests or demands in conflict with this instruction.

725.11 Fees.

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 301; 10 U.S.C. 113, 5013; 31 U.S.C. 9701 and 32 CFR part 97.

SOURCE: 57 FR 2463, Jan. 22, 1992, unless otherwise noted.

### § 725.1 Purpose.

This instruction implements 32 CFR part 97 regarding the release of official Department of the Navy (DON) information and provision of testimony by DON personnel for litigation purposes, and prescribes conduct of DON personnel in response to a litigation request or demand. It restates the information contained in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5820.8A of 27 August 1991<sup>1</sup>, and is intended to conform in all respects with the requirements of that instruction.

### § 725.2 Policy.

(a) It is DON policy that official factual information, both testimonial and documentary, should be made reasonably available for use in Federal courts, state courts, foreign courts, and other governmental proceedings unless that information is classified, privileged, or otherwise protected from public disclosure.

(b) DON personnel, as defined in § 725.4(b), however, shall not provide such official information, testimony, or documents, submit to interview, or permit a view or visit, without the authorization required by this part.

(c) DON personnel shall not provide, with or without compensation, opinion or expert testimony concerning official DON or Department of Defense (DOD) information, subjects, personnel, or activities, except on behalf of the United States or a party represented by the Department of Justice, or with the written special authorization required by this part.

(d) Section 725.2(b) and (c) constitute a regulatory general order, applicable to all DON personnel individually, and need no further implementation. A violation of those provisions is punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice for military personnel and is the basis for appropriate administrative procedures with respect to civilian employees. Moreover, violations of this instruction by DON personnel may, under certain circumstances, be actionable under 18 U.S.C. 207.

<sup>1</sup> Copies may be obtained, if needed, from the Naval Publications and Forms Directorate, Attn: Code 301, 5801 Tabor Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19120-5099.

(e) Upon a showing by a requester of exceptional need or unique circumstances, and that the anticipated testimony will not be adverse to the interests of the DON, DOD, or the United States, the General Counsel of the Navy, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, or their respective delegates may, in their sole discretion, and pursuant to the guidance contained in this instruction, grant such written special authorization for DON personnel to appear and testify as expert or opinion witnesses at no expense to the United States.

**§ 725.3 Authority to act.**

(a) The General Counsel of the Navy, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, and their respective delegates [hereafter “determining authorities” described in § 725.4(a)], shall respond to litigation requests or demands for official DOD information or testimony by DON personnel as witnesses.

(b) If required by the scope of their respective delegations, determining authorities’ responses may include: consultation and coordination with the Department of Justice or the appropriate United States Attorney as required; referral of matters proprietary to another DOD component to that component; determination whether official information originated by the Navy may be released in litigation; and determination whether DOD personnel assigned to or affiliated with the Navy may be interviewed, contacted, or used as witnesses concerning official DOD information or as expert or opinion witnesses. Following coordination with the appropriate commander, a response may further include whether installations, facilities, ships, or aircraft may be visited or inspected; what, if any, conditions will be imposed upon any release, interview, contact, testimony, visit, or inspection; what, if any, fees shall be charged or waived for access under the fee assessment considerations set forth in § 725.11; and what, if any, claims of privilege, pursuant to this instruction, may be invoked before any tribunal.

**§ 725.4 Definitions.**

(a) *Determining authority.* The cognizant DON or DOD official designated

to grant or deny a litigation request. In all cases in which the United States is, or might reasonably become, a party, or in which expert testimony is requested, the Judge Advocate General or the General Counsel of the Navy, depending on the subject matter of the request, will act as determining authority. In all other cases, the responsibility to act as determining authority has been delegated to all officers exercising general court-martial convening authority, or to their subordinate commands, and to other commands and activities indicated in § 725.6.

(b) *DON personnel.* Active duty and former military personnel of the naval service including retirees; personnel of other DOD components serving with a DON component; Naval Academy midshipmen; present and former civilian employees of the DON including non-appropriated fund activity employees; non-U.S. nationals performing services overseas for the DON under provisions of status of forces agreements; and other specific individuals or entities hired through contractual agreements by or on behalf of DON, or performing services under such agreements for DON (e.g., consultants, contractors and their employees and personnel).

(c) *Factual and expert or opinion testimony.* DON policy favors disclosure of factual information if disclosure does not violate the criteria stated in § 725.8. The distinction between factual matters, and expert or opinion matters (where DON policy favors non-disclosure), is not always clear. The considerations set forth below pertain.

(1) Naval personnel may merely be percipient witnesses to an incident, in which event their testimony would be purely factual. On the other hand, they may be involved with the matter only through an after-the-event investigation (e.g., JAGMAN investigation). Describing the manner in which they conducted their investigation and asking them to identify factual conclusions in their report would likewise constitute factual matters to which they might testify. In contrast, asking them to adopt or reaffirm their findings of fact, opinions, and recommendations, or asking them to form or express any other opinion—particularly one based

upon matters submitted by counsel or going to the ultimate issue of causation or liability—would clearly constitute precluded testimony under the above policy.

(2) Naval personnel, by virtue of their training, often form opinions because they are required to do so in the course of their duties. If their opinions are formed prior to, or contemporaneously with, the matter in issue, and are routinely required of them in the course of the proper performance of their professional duties, they constitute essentially factual matters (i.e., the opinion they previously held). Opinions formed after the event in question, including responses to hypothetical questions, generally constitute the sort of opinion or expert testimony which this instruction is intended to severely restrict.

(3) Characterization of expected testimony by a requester as fact, opinion, or expert is not binding on the determining authority. When there is doubt as to whether or not expert or opinion (as opposed to factual) testimony is being sought, advice may be obtained informally from, or the request forwarded, to the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (General Litigation) or the Associate General Counsel (Litigation) for resolution.

(d) *Litigation.* All pretrial, trial, and post-trial stages of all existing or reasonably anticipated judicial or administrative actions, hearings, investigations, or similar proceedings before civilian courts, commissions, boards (including the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals), or other tribunals, foreign and domestic. This term includes responses to discovery requests, depositions, and other pretrial proceedings, as well as responses to formal or informal requests by attorneys or others in situations involving, or reasonably anticipated to involve, civil or criminal litigation.

(e) *Official information.* All information of any kind, however stored, in the custody and control of the DOD and its components including the DON; relating to information in the custody and control of DOD or its components; or acquired by DOD personnel or its component personnel as part of their official duties or because of their official status within DOD or its components,

while such personnel were employed by or on behalf of the DOD or on active duty with the United States Armed Forces (determining whether “official information” is sought, as opposed to non-DOD information, rests with the determining authority identified in § 725.6, rather than the requester).

(f) *Request or demand (legal process).* Subpoena, order, or other request by a federal, state, or foreign court of competent jurisdiction, by any administrative agency thereof, or by any party or other person (subject to the exceptions stated in § 725.5) for production, disclosure, or release of official DOD information or for appearance, deposition, or testimony of DON personnel as witnesses.

#### § 725.5 Applicability.

(a) This instruction applies to all present and former civilian and military personnel of the DON whether employed by, or assigned to, DON temporarily or permanently. Affected personnel are defined more fully in § 725.4(b).

(b) This instruction applies only to situations involving existing or reasonably anticipated litigation, as defined in § 725.4(d), when DOD information or witnesses are sought, whether or not the United States, the DOD, or its components are parties thereto. It does not apply to formal or informal requests for information in other situations.

(c) This instruction provides guidance only for DON operation and activities of its present and former personnel in responding to litigation requests. It is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity against the United States, DOD, or DON.

(d) This instruction is not intended to infringe upon or displace the responsibilities committed to the Department of Justice in conducting litigation on behalf of the United States.

(e) This instruction does not supersede or modify existing laws, DOD or DON regulations, directives, or instructions governing testimony of DON personnel or release of official DOD or DON information during grand jury proceedings.

(f) This instruction does not control release of official information in response to requests unrelated to litigation or under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. 552, or the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552a. This instruction does not preclude treating any written request for DON records as a request under the FOIA or Privacy Acts. Activities are encouraged to treat such requests for documents under the FOIA or the Privacy Act if they are invoked by the requestor either explicitly or by fair implication. See 32 CFR 701.3(a), 701.10(a). Activities are reminded that such treatment does not absolve them of the responsibility to respond in a timely fashion to legal process. In any event, if the official information requested pertains to a litigation matter which the United States is a present or potential party, the release authority should notify the delegate of the General Counsel or the Judge Advocate General, under § 725.6.

(g) This part does not apply to release of official information or testimony by DON personnel in the following situations:

(1) Before courts-martial convened by any DOD component, or in administrative proceedings conducted by, or on behalf of, such component;

(2) Under administrative proceedings conducted by, or on behalf of, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) or the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the Federal Services Impasse Panel, or under a negotiated grievance procedure under a collective bargaining agreement to which the Government is a party;

(3) In response to requests by Federal Government counsel, or counsel representing the interests of the Federal Government, in litigation conducted, in whole or in part, on behalf of the United States (e.g., Medical Care Recovery Act claims, affirmative claims, or subpoenas issued by, or concurred in by, Government counsel when the United States is a party), but the regulation does apply to an action brought under the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act in which a private party brings an action in the name of the United States but in which the Department of Justice either has not yet

determined to intervene in the litigation or has declined to intervene;

(4) As part of the assistance required by the Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program under DOD Directive 5220.6<sup>2</sup>;

(5) Release of copies of Manual of the Judge Advocate General (JAGMAN) investigations, to the next of kin (or their representatives) of deceased or incompetent naval personnel;

(6) Release of information by DON personnel to counsel retained on their behalf for purposes of litigation, unless that information is classified, privileged, or otherwise protected from disclosure (in the latter event, compliance with 32 CFR part 97 and this part is required);

(7) Cases involving garnishment orders for child support and/or alimony. The release of official information in these cases is governed by 5 CFR 581 and SECNAVINST 7200.16<sup>3</sup>, or;

(8) Release of information to Federal, state, and local prosecuting and law enforcement authorities, in conjunction with an investigation conducted by a DOD component or DON criminal investigative organization.

(h) This part does not preclude official comment on matters in litigation in appropriate cases.

(i) The DOD General Counsel may notify DOD components that DOD will assume primary responsibility for coordinating all litigation requests for demands for official DOD information or testimony of DOD personnel in litigation involving terrorism, espionage, nuclear weapons, and intelligence sources or means. Accordingly, determining officials who receive requests pertaining to such litigation shall notify the Associate General Counsel (Litigation) or the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (International Law or General Litigation) who shall consult and coordinate with DOD General Counsel prior to any response to such requests.

(j) *Relationship with Federal Rules of Procedure.* The requirements imposed by this instruction are intended, among other things, to provide adequate notice to DON regarding the

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 1 to § 725.1.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 1 to § 725.1.



scope of proposed discovery. This will assure that certain DON information, which properly should be withheld, is not inadvertently released in response to a litigation request or demand, including a subpoena or other request for discovery issued under Federal rules of procedure. When the United States is a party to Federal litigation and the party opponent uses discovery methods (e.g., request for interrogatories and admissions, depositions) set forth in Federal rules of procedure, the Judge Advocate General or General Counsel, in consultation with representatives of the Department of Justice or the cognizant United States Attorney, may determine whether the requirement for a separate written request in accordance with § 725.7 should be waived. Even if this requirement is waived, however, DON personnel who are subpoenaed to testify still will be required to obtain the written permission described in § 725.2.

**§ 725.6 Authority to determine and respond.**

(a) *Matters proprietary to DON.* If a litigation request or demand is made of DON personnel for official DON or DOD information or for testimony concerning such information, the individual to whom the request or demand is made will immediately notify the cognizant DON official designated in § 725.6(c) and (d), who will determine availability and respond to the request or demand.

(b) *Matters proprietary to another DOD component.* If a DON activity receives a litigation request or demand for official information originated by another DOD component or for non-DON personnel presently or formerly assigned to another DOD component, the DON activity will forward appropriate portions of the request or demand to the DOD component originating the information, to the components where the personnel are assigned, or to the components where the personnel were formerly assigned, for action under 32 CFR part 97. The forwarding DON activity will also notify the requester and court (if appropriate) or other authority of its transfer of the request or demand.

(c) *Litigation matters to which the United States is, or might reasonably be-*

*come, a party.* Examples of such instances include suits under the Federal Tort Claims Act, Freedom of Information Act, Medical Care Recovery Act, Tucker Act, and suits against Government contractors where the contractor may interplead the United States or seek indemnification from the United States for any judgment paid, e.g., aviation contractors or asbestos matters. Generally, a suit in which the plaintiff is representing the interests of the United States under the Medical Care Recovery Act is not a litigation matter to which the United States is, or might reasonably become, a party. Determining authorities, if in doubt whether the United States is likely to become a party to the litigation, should seek guidance from representatives of the Offices of the Judge Advocate General or General Counsel. The Judge Advocate General and the General Counsel have the authority to determine whether a litigation request should be forwarded to them, or retained by a determining authority, for resolution.

(1) Litigation requests regarding matters assigned to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy under Navy Regulations, art. 0331 (1990)<sup>4</sup>, shall be referred to the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (DAJAG) for General Litigation, 200 Stovall Street, Alexandria, VA 22332-2400, who will respond for the Judge Advocate General or transmit the request to the appropriate Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General for response.

(2) Litigation requests regarding matters assigned to the General Counsel of the Navy under Navy Regs., art. 0327 (1990)<sup>5</sup>, shall be referred to the cognizant Command Counsel under, and subject to, limitations set forth in § 725.6(d)(2). That Command Counsel may either respond or refer the matter for action to another office. Requests involving asbestos litigation shall be referred to the Office of Counsel, Naval Sea Systems Command Headquarters, Personnel and Labor Law Section (Code 00LD), Washington, DC 20362-5101. Matters not clearly within the purview of a particular command counsel shall

<sup>4</sup> See footnote 1 to § 725.1.

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 1 to § 725.1.

be referred to Associate General Counsel (Litigation), who may either respond or refer the matter for action to another office.

(3) Matters involving the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals shall be forwarded to these respective counsel except where the determination may involve the assertion of the deliberative process privilege before that Board. In such an event, the matter shall be forwarded for determination to the Associate General Counsel (Litigation).

(d) *Litigation matters in which the United States is not, and is reasonably not expected to become, a party—(1) Matters within the cognizance of the Judge Advocate General—(i) Fact witnesses.* Requests to interview, depose, or obtain testimony of any present or former DON personnel as defined in § 725.4(b) about purely factual matters shall be forwarded to the Navy or Marine Corps officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction (OEGCMJ) in whose chain of command the prospective witness or requested documents lie. That determining authority will respond for the Judge Advocate General under criteria set forth in § 725.8.

(A) If the request pertains to personnel assigned to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Office of the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, or an Echelon 2 command located in the Washington, DC, area, it shall be forwarded to that office which will likewise respond for the Judge Advocate General under the criteria set forth in § 725.8.

(B) If a request pertains to Marine Corps personnel assigned to Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters Marine Corps, or to other Marine Corps commands located in the Washington, DC, area, it shall be forwarded to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (JAR), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, DC 20380-0001, which will respond for the Judge Advocate General under criteria set forth in § 725.8.

(C) Nothing here shall prevent a determining authority from referring requests or demands to another determining authority better suited under the circumstances to determine the matter and respond, but the requester

shall be notified of the referral. Further, each determining authority specified in this paragraph may further delegate his or her decisional authority to a principal staff member, staff judge advocate, or legal advisor.

(D) In the alternative, the requester may forward the request to the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (General Litigation), who may refer the matter to another determining authority for response, and so notify the requester.

(ii) *Visits and views.* A request to visit a DON activity, ship, or unit, or to inspect material or spaces located there will be forwarded to one of the authorities stated in § 725.6(d)(1)(i), who will respond on behalf of the Judge Advocate General. Action taken by that authority will be coordinated with the commanding officer of the activity, ship, or unit at issue, or with his or her staff judge advocate (if applicable). The military mission of the unit shall normally take precedence over any visit or view. The commanding officer may independently prescribe reasonable conditions as to time, place, and circumstances to protect against compromise of classified or privileged material, intrusion into restricted spaces, and unauthorized photography.

(iii) *Documents.* 10 U.S.C. 7861 provides that the Secretary of the Navy has custody and charge of all DON books, records, and property. Under DOD Directive 5530.1<sup>6</sup>, the Secretary of the Navy's sole delegate for service of process is the General Counsel of the Navy. See 32 CFR 257.5(c). All process for such documents shall be served upon the General Counsel at the Department of the Navy, Washington, DC, 20350-1000, who will refer the matter to the proper delegate for action. Matters referred to the Judge Advocate General will normally be provided to the determining authorities described in § 725.6(c) and (d). That authority will respond per criteria in § 725.8. Process not properly served on the General Counsel is insufficient to constitute a legal demand and shall be processed as a request by counsel. Requests for documents maintained by the National

<sup>6</sup> See footnote 1 to § 725.1.

Personnel Records Center will be determined by the official provided in § 725.8(b)(2)(iii).

(iv) *Expert or opinion requests.* Any request for expert or opinion consultations, interviews, depositions, or testimony will be referred to the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (General Litigation) who will respond for the Judge Advocate General, or transmit the request to the appropriate DAJAG for response. Matters not clearly within the purview of a particular Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General will be retained by the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (General Litigation), who may either respond or refer the matter to another determining authority for response.

(2) *Matters within the cognizance of the General Counsel of the Navy*—(i) *Matters not involving issues of Navy policy.* Such matters shall be forwarded for determination to the respective counsel for Naval Sea Systems Command, Naval Air Systems Command, Naval Supply Systems Command, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Space and Naval Warfare Command, Office of the Navy Comptroller, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Office of the Chief of Naval Research, Military Sealift Command, Office of Civilian Personnel Policy, or to the Assistant General Counsel (Acquisition), depending upon who has cognizance over the information or personnel at issue.

(ii) *Matters involving issues of Navy policy.* Such matters shall be forwarded for determination to the General Counsel of the Navy via the Associate General Counsel (Litigation).

(iii) *Matters involving asbestos litigation.* Such matters shall be forwarded to the Office of Counsel, Naval Sea Systems Command Headquarters, Personnel and Labor Law Section (Code 00LD), Washington, DC 20362-5101.

(3) *Matters not clearly within the cognizance of either the Judge Advocate General or the General Counsel.* Such matters may be sent to the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (General Litigation) or the Associate General Counsel (Litigation), who will, in consultation with the other, determine the appropriate authority to respond to the request.

#### **§ 725.7 Contents of a proper request or demand.**

(a) *Routine requests.* If official information is sought, through testimony or otherwise, a detailed written request must be submitted to the appropriate determining authority far enough in advance to assure an informed and timely evaluation of the request, and prevention of adverse effects on the mission of the command or activity that must respond. The determining authority shall decide whether sufficient information has been provided by the requester. Absent independent information, the following data is necessary to assess a request.

(1) *Identification of parties, their counsel and the nature of the litigation.* (i) Caption of case, docket number, court.

(ii) Name, address, and telephone number of all counsel.

(iii) The date and time on which the documents, information, or testimony sought must be produced; the requested location for production; and, if applicable, the estimated length of time that attendance of the DON personnel will be required.

(2) *Identification of information or documents requested.* (i) A description, in as much detail as possible, of the documents, information, or testimony sought, including the current military service, status (active, separated, retired), social security number, if known, of the subject of the requested pay, medical, or service records;

(ii) The location of the records, including the name, address, and telephone number, if known, of the person from whom the documents, information, or testimony is sought; and

(iii) A statement of whether factual, opinion, or expert testimony is requested (see §§ 725.4(c) and 725.8(b)(3)(ii)).

(3) *Description of why the information is needed.* (i) A brief summary of the facts of the case and the present posture of the case.

(ii) A statement of the relevance of the matters sought to the proceedings at issue.

(iii) If expert or opinion testimony is sought, an explanation of why exceptional need or unique circumstances

exist justifying such testimony, including why it is not reasonably available from any other source.

(b) *Additional considerations.* The circumstances surrounding the underlying litigation, including whether the United States is a party, and the nature and expense of the requests made by a party may require additional information before a determination can be made. Providing the following information or stipulations in the original request may expedite review and eliminate the need for additional correspondence with the determining authority.

(1) A statement of the requester's willingness to pay in advance all reasonable expenses and costs of searching for and producing documents, information, or personnel, including travel expenses and accommodations (if applicable);

(2) In cases in which deposition testimony is sought, a statement of whether attendance at trial or later deposition testimony is anticipated and requested. A single deposition normally should suffice;

(3) An agreement to notify the determining authority at least 10 working days in advance of all interviews, depositions, or testimony. Additional time for notification may be required where the witness is a DON health care provider or where the witness is located overseas;

(4) An agreement to conduct the deposition at the location of the witness, unless the witness and his or her commanding officer or cognizant superior, as applicable, stipulate otherwise;

(5) In the case of former DON personnel, a brief description of the length and nature of their duties while in DON employment, and a statement of whether such duties involved, directly or indirectly, the information or matters as to which the person will testify;

(6) An agreement to provide free of charge to any witness a signed copy of any written statement he or she may make, or, in the case of an oral deposition, a copy of that deposition transcript, if taken by a stenographer, or a video tape copy, if taken solely by video tape, if not prohibited by applicable rules of court;

(7) An agreement that if the local rules of procedure controlling the litigation so provide, the witness will be given an opportunity to read, sign, and correct the deposition at no cost to the witness or the Government;

(8) A statement of understanding that the United States reserves the right to have a representative present at any interview or deposition; and

(9) A statement that counsel for other parties to the case will be provided with a copy of all correspondence originated by the determining authority so they may have the opportunity to submit any related litigation requests and participate in any discovery.

(c) *Response to deficient requests.* A letter request that is deficient in providing necessary information may be returned to the requester by the determining authority with an explanation of the deficiencies and a statement that no further action will be taken until they are corrected. If a subpoena has been received for official information, counsel should promptly determine the appropriate action to take in response to the subpoena. See § 725.9(g).

(d) *Emergency requests.* Written requests are generally required by 32 CFR part 97.

(1) The determining authority, identified in § 725.6, has discretion to waive that requirement in the event of a bona fide emergency, under conditions set forth here, which were not anticipated in the course of proper pretrial planning and discovery. Oral requests and subsequent determinations should be reserved for instances where factual matters are sought, and compliance with the requirements of a proper written request would result in the effective denial of the request and cause an injustice in the outcome of the litigation for which the information is sought. No requester has a right to make an oral request and receive a determination. Whether to permit such an exceptional procedure is a decision within the sole discretion of the determining authority, unless overruled by the General Counsel or the Judge Advocate General, as appropriate.

(2) If the determining authority concludes that the request, or any portion of it, meets the emergency test, he or